

E 458

.3

V 17

Permalife•
pH 8.5

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT LAIRD VALLANDIGHAM,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 14, 1863.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. Mr. Speaker, indorsed at the recent election within the same district for which I still hold a seat on this floor, by a majority four times greater than ever before, I speak to-day in the name and by the authority of the people who, for six years, have intrusted me with the office of a Representative. Loyal, in the true and highest sense of the word, to the Constitution and the Union, they have proved themselves devotedly attached to and worthy of the liberties to secure which the Union and the Constitution were established. With candor and freedom, therefore, as their Representative, and much plainness of speech, but with the dignity and decency due to this presence, I propose to consider the STATE OF THE UNION to-day, and to inquire what the duty is of every public man and every citizen in this the very crisis of the Great Revolution.

It is now two years, sir, since Congress assembled soon after the Presidential election. A sectional anti-slavery party had then just succeeded through the forms of the Constitution. For the first time a President had been chosen upon a platform of avowed hostility to an institution peculiar to nearly one half of the States of the Union, and who had himself proclaimed that there was an irrepressible conflict because of that institution between the States; and that the Union could not endure "part slave and part free." Congress met, therefore, in the midst of the profoundest agitation, not here only but throughout the entire South. Revolution glared upon us. Repeated efforts for conciliation and compromise were attempted in Congress and out of it. All were rejected by the party just coming into power, except only the promise in the last hours of the session, and that, too, against the consent of a majority of that party both in the Senate and House; that Congress—not the Executive—should never be authorized to abolish or interfere with slavery in the States where it existed. South Carolina seceded; Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas speedily followed. The confederate government was established. The

other slave States held back. Virginia demanded a peace congress. The commissioners met, and, after some time, agreed upon terms of final adjustment. But neither in the Senate nor the House were they allowed even a respectful consideration. The President elect left his home in February, and journeyed towards this capital, jesting as he came; proclaiming that the crisis was only artificial, and that "nobody was hurt." He entered this city under cover of night and in disguise. On the 4th of March he was inaugurated, surrounded by soldiery; and, swearing to support the Constitution of the United States, announced in the same breath that the platform of his party should be the law unto him. From that moment all hope of peaceable adjustment fled. But for a little while, either with unsteadfast sincerity or in premeditated deceit, the policy of peace was proclaimed, even to the evacuation of Sumter and the other Federal forts and arsenals in the seceded States. Why that policy was suddenly abandoned, time will fully disclose. But just after the spring elections, and the secret meeting in this city of the Governors of several northern and western States, a fleet carrying a large number of men was sent down ostensibly to provision Fort Sumter. The authorities of South Carolina eagerly accepted the challenge, and bombarded the fort into surrender, while the fleet fired not a gun, but, just so soon as the flag was struck, bore away and returned to the North. It was Sunday, the 14th of April, 1861; and that day the President, in fatal haste and without the advice or consent of Congress, issued his proclamation, dated the next day, calling out seventy-five thousand militia for three months, to repossess the forts, places, and property seized from the United States, and commanding the insurgents to disperse in twenty days. Again the gage was taken up by the South, and thus the flames of a civil war, the grandest, bloodiest, and saddest in history, lighted up the whole heavens. Virginia forthwith seceded. North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas followed; Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Mississippi were in a blaze of agitation, and within a

week from the proclamation, the line of the Confederate States was transferred from the cotton States to the Potomac, and almost to the Ohio and the Missouri, and their population and fighting men doubled.

In the North and West, too, the storm raged with the fury of a hurricane. Never in history was anything equal to it. Men, women, and children, native and foreign born, Church and State, clergy and laymen, were all swept along with the current. Distinction of age, sex, station, party, perished in an instant. Thousands bent before the tempest; and here and there only was one found bold enough, foolhardy enough it may have been, to bend not, and him it smote as a consuming fire.

The spirit of persecution for opinion's sake, almost extinct in the Old World, now, by some sterious transmigration, appeared incarnate in New.

Social relations were dissolved; friendships broken up; the ties of family and kindred snapped asunder. Stripes and hanging were everywhere threatened, sometimes executed. Assassination was invoked; slander sharpened his tooth; falsehood crushed truth to the earth; reason fled; madness reigned. Not justice only escaped to the skies, but peace returned to the bosom of God, whence she came. The gospel of love perished; hate sat enthroned, and the sacrifices of blood smoked upon every altar.

But the reign of the mob was inaugurated only to be supplanted by the iron domination of arbitrary power. Constitutional limitation was broken down; *habeas corpus* fell; liberty of the press, of speech, of the person, of mails, of travel, of one's own house, and of religion; the right to bear arms, due process of law, judicial trial by jury, trial at all; every badge and monument of freedom in republican government or kingly government—all went down at a blow; and the chief law officer of the crown—I beg pardon, sir, but it is easy now to fall into this courtly language—the Attorney General, first of all men, proclaimed in the United States the maxim of Roman servility: *Whatever pleases the President, that is law!* Prisoners of State were then first heard of here. Midnight and arbitrary arrests commenced; travel was interdicted; trade embargoed; passports demanded; bastilles were introduced; strange oaths invented; a secret police organized; "piping" began; informers multiplied; spies now first appeared in America. The right to declare war, to raise and support armies, and to provide and maintain a navy was usurped by the Executive; and in a little more than two months a land and naval force of over three hundred thousand men was in the field or upon the sea. An army of public plunderers followed, and corruption struggled with power in friendly strife for the mastery at home.

On the 4th of July Congress met, not to seek peace; not to rebuke usurpation nor to restrain power; not certainly to deliberate; not even to legislate, but to register and ratify the edicts and acts of the Executive; and in your language, sir, upon the first day of the session, to invoke a universal baptism of fire and blood amid the roar of cannon and the din of battle. Free speech was had only at the risk of a prison; possibly of life. Opposition was silenced by the fierce clamor of

"disloyalty." All business not of war was voted out of order. Five hundred thousand men, an immense navy, and two and hundred fifty millions of money were speedily granted. In twenty, at most in sixty days, the rebellion was to be crushed out. To doubt it was treason. Abject submission was demanded. Lay down your arms, sue for peace, surrender your leaders—*forfeiture, death*—this was the only language heard on this floor. The galleries responded; the corridors echoed; and contractors and placemen and other venal patriots everywhere gnashed upon the friends of peace as they passed by. In five weeks seventy-eight public and private acts and joint resolutions, with declaratory resolutions, in the Senate and House, quite as numerous, all full of slaughter, were hurried through without delay and almost without debate.

This was CIVIL WAR inaugurated in America. Can any man to-day see the end of it?

And now pardon me, sir, if I pause here a moment to define my own position at this time upon this great question.

Sir, I am one of that number who have opposed abolitionism, or the political development of the anti-slavery sentiment of the North and West, from the beginning. In school, at college, at the bar, in public assemblies, in the Legislature, in Congress, boy and man, as a private citizen and in public life, in time of peace and in time of war, at all times and at every sacrifice, I have fought against it. It cost me ten years' exclusion from office and honor, at that period of life when honors are sweetest. No matter: I learned early to do right and to wait. Sir, it is but the development of the spirit of intermeddling, whose children are strife and murder. Cain troubled himself about the sacrifices of Abel, and slew him. Most of the wars, contentions, litigation, and bloodshed, from the beginning of time, have been its fruits. The spirit of non-intervention is the very spirit of peace and concord. I do not believe that if slavery had never existed here we would have had no sectional controversies. This very civil war might have happened fifty, perhaps a hundred years later. Other and stronger causes of discontent and of disunion, it may be, have existed between other States and sections, and are now being developed every day into maturity. The spirit of intervention assumed the form of abolitionism because slavery was odious in name and by association to the northern mind, and because it was that which most obviously marks the different civilizations of the two sections. The South herself, in her early and later efforts to rid herself of it, had exposed the weak and offensive parts of slavery to the world. Abolition intermeddling taught her at last to search for and defend the assumed social, economic, and political merit and values of the institution. But there never was an hour from the beginning when it did not seem to me as clear as the sun at broad noon, that the agitation in any form in the North and West of the slavery question must sooner or later end in disunion and civil war. This was the opinion and prediction for years of Whig and Democratic statesmen alike; and after the unfortunate dissolution of the Whig party in 1854, and

the organization of the present Republican party upon an exclusively anti-slavery and sectional basis, the event was inevitable; because, in the then existing temper of the public mind, and after the education through the press and by the pulpit, the lecture and the political canvass for twenty years, of a generation taught to hate slavery and the South, the success of that party, possessed, as it was, of every engine of political, business, social, and religious influence, was certain. It was only a question of time, and short time. Such was its strength, indeed, that I do not believe that the union of the Democratic party in 1860 on any candidate, even though he had been supported also by the entire so-called conservative or anti-Lincoln vote of the country, would have availed to defeat it; and if it had, the success of the abolition party would only have been postponed four years longer. The disease had fastened too strongly upon the system to be headed until it had run its course. The doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict" had been taught too long and accepted too widely and earnestly to die out, until it should culminate in secession and disunion; and, if coercion were resorted to, then in civil war. I believed from the first that it was the purpose of some of the apostles of that doctrine to force a collision between the North and the South, either to bring about a separation or to find a vain but bloody pretext for abolishing slavery in the States. In any event, I knew, or thought I knew, that the end was certain collision, and death to the Union.

Believing thus, I have for years past denounced those who taught that doctrine with all the vehemence, the bitterness, if you choose—I thought it a righteous, a patriotic bitterness—of an earnest and impassioned nature. Thinking thus, I forewarned all who believed the doctrine, or followed the party which taught it, with a sincerity and a depth of conviction as profound as ever penetrated the heart of man. And when, for eight years past, over and over again, I have proclaimed to the people that the success of a sectional anti-slavery party would be the beginning of disunion and civil war in America, I believed it. I did. I had read history, and studied human nature, and meditated for years upon the character of our institutions and form of government, and of the people South as well as North; and I could not doubt the event. But the people did not believe me, nor those older and wiser and greater than I. They rejected the prophecy, and stoned the prophets. The candidate of the Republican party was chosen President. Secession began. Civil war was imminent. It was no petty insurrection; no temporary combination to obstruct the execution of the laws in certain States; but a revolution, systematic, deliberate, determined, and with the consent of a majority of the people of each State which seceded. Causeless it may have been; wicked it may have been; but there it was; not to be refiled or, still less to be laughed at, but to be dealt with by statesmen as a fact. No display of vigor or force alone, however sudden or great, could have arrested it even at the outset. It was disunion at last. The wolf had come. But civil war had not yet followed. In my deliberate and most solemn judgment,

there was but one wise and masterly mode of dealing with it. Non-coercion would avert civil war, and compromise; crush out both abolitionism and secession. The parent and the child would thus both perish. But a resort to force would at once precipitate war, hasten secession, extend disunion, and, while it lasted, utterly cut off all hope of compromise. I believed that war, if long enough continued, would be final, eternal disunion. I said it; I meant it; and, accordingly, to the utmost of my ability and influence, I exerted myself in behalf of the policy of non-coercion. It was adopted by Mr. Buchanan's Administration, with the almost unanimous consent of the Democratic and constitutional Union parties in and out of Congress; and, in February, with the concurrence of a majority of the Republican party in the Senate and this House. But that party, most disastrously for the country, refused all compromise. How, indeed, could they accept any? That which the South demanded and the Democratic and conservative parties of the North and West were willing to grant, and which alone could avail to keep the peace and save the Union, implied a surrender of the sole vital element of the party and its platform—the very principle, in fact, upon which it had just won the contest for the Presidency; not, indeed, by a majority of the popular vote—the majority was nearly a million against it—but under the forms of the Constitution. Sir, the crime, the "high crime" of the Republican party was not so much its refusal to compromise, as its original organization upon a basis and doctrine wholly inconsistent with the stability of the Constitution and the peace of the Union.

But to resume: the session of Congress expired. The President-elect was inaugurated; and now, if only the policy of non-coercion could be maintained, and war thus averted, time would do its work in the North and the South, and final peaceable adjustment and reunion be secured. Some time in March it was announced that the President had resolved to continue the policy of his predecessor, and even go a step further, and evacuate Sumter and the other Federal forts and arsenals in the seceded States. His own party acquiesced; the whole country rejoiced. The policy of non-coercion had triumphed, and for once, sir, in my life I found myself in an immense majority. No man then pretended that a Union founded in consent could be cemented by force. Nay, more, the President and the Secretary of State went further. Said Mr. Seward, in an official diplomatic letter to Mr. Adams:

"For these reasons he [the President] would not be disposed to reject a cardinal doctrine of theirs, [the seceders, i. e.,] namely, that the Federal Government could not reduce the seceding States to obedience by conquest, although he were disposed to question that proposition. But in fact the President willingly accepts it as true. Only an imperial or despotic Government could subvert thoroughly disaffected and insurrectionary members of the State."

Pardon me, sir, but I beg to know whether the conviction of the President and his Secretary, is not the philosophy of the persistent and most vigorous efforts made by this Administration, and first of all through this same Secretary, the moment war broke out and ever since till the late

elections, to convert the United States into an imperial or despotic Government? But Mr. Seward adds, and I agree with him:

"This Federal Republican system of ours is, of all forms of government, the very one which is most unfitted for such a labor."

This, sir, was on the 10th of April, and yet that very day the fleet was under sail for Charleston. The policy of peace had been abandoned. Collision followed; the militia were ordered out: civil war began.

Now, sir, on the 14th of April, I believed that coercion would bring on war, and war disunion. More than that, I believed, what you all in your hearts believe to-day, that the South could never be conquered—never. And not that only, but I was satisfied—and you of the abolition party have now proved it to the world—that the secret but real purpose of the war was to abolish slavery in the States. In any event, I did not doubt that whatever might be the momentary impulses of those in power, and whatever pledges they might make in the midst of the fury for the Constitution, the Union, and the flag, yet the natural and inexorable logic of revolutions would, sooner or later, drive them into that policy, and with it to its final but inevitable result, the change of our present democratical form of government into an imperial despotism.

These were my convictions on the 14th of April. Had I changed them on the 15th, when I read the President's proclamation, and become convinced that I had been wrong all my life, and that all history was a fable, and all human nature false in its development from the beginning of time, I would have changed my public conduct also. But my convictions did not change. I thought that if war was disunion on the 14th of April, it was equally disunion on the 15th, and at all times. Believing this, I could not, as an honest man, a Union man and a patriot, lend an active support to the war; and I did not. I had rather my right arm were plucked from its socket, and cast into eternal burnings, than, with my convictions, to have thus defiled my soul with the guilt of moral perjury. Sir, I was not taught in that school which proclaims that "all is fair in politics." I loathe, abhor, and detest the execrable maxim. I stamp upon it. No State can endure a single generation whose public men practice it. Whoever teaches it is a corrupter of youth. What we most want in these times, and at all times, is honest and independent public men. That man who is dishonest in politics is not honest, at heart, in anything; and sometimes moral cowardice is dishonesty. Do right; and trust to God, and Truth, and the People. Perish office, perish honors, perish life itself; but do the thing that is right, and do it like a man. I did it. Certainly, sir, I could not doubt what he must suffer who dare defy the opinions and the passions, not to say the madness, of twenty millions of people. Had I not read history? Did I not know human nature? But I appealed to TIME, and right nobly hath the Avenger answered me.

I did not support the war; and to-day I bless God that not the smell of so much as one drop of its blood lies upon my garments. Sir, I censure

no brave man who rushed patriotically into this war; neither will I quarrel with any one, here or elsewhere, who gave to it an honest support. Had their convictions been mine, I, too, would doubtless have done as they did. With my convictions I could not.

But I was a Representative. War existed—by whose act no matter—not mine. The President, the Senate, the House, and the country, all said that there should be war—war for the Union; a union of consent and goodwill. Our southern brethren were to be whipped back into love and fellowship at the point of the bayonet. Oh, monstrous delusion! I can comprehend a war to compel a people to accept a master; to change a form of government; to give up territory; to abolish a domestic institution—in short, a war of conquest and subjugation; but a war for Union! Was the Union thus made? Was it ever thus preserved? Sir, history will record that after nearly six thousand years of folly and wickedness in every form and administration of government, theocratic, democratic, monarchic, oligarchic, despotic, and mixed, it was reserved to American statesmanship in the nineteenth century of the Christian era to try the grand experiment on a scale the most costly and gigantic in its proportions, of creating love by force, and developing fraternal affection by war; and history will record, too, on the same page, the utter, disastrous, and most bloody failure of the experiment.

But to return: the country was at war; and I belonged to that school of politics which teaches that when we are at war, the Government—I do not mean the Executive alone, but the Government—is entitled to demand and have, without resistance, such number of men, and such amount of money and supplies generally, as may be necessary for the war, until an appeal can be had to the people. Before that tribunal alone, in the first instance, must the question of the continuance of the war be tried. This was Mr. Calhoun's opinion, and he laid it down very broadly and strongly in a speech on the loan bill, in 1841. Speaking of supplies, he said:

"I hold that there is a distinction in this respect between a state of peace and war. In the latter, the right of withholding supplies ought ever to be held subordinate to the energetic and successful prosecution of the war. I go further, and regard the withholding supplies, with a view of forcing the country into a dishonorable peace, as not only to be what it has been called, moral treason, but very little short of actual treason itself."

Upon this principle, sir, he acted afterwards in the Mexican war. Speaking of that war in 1847, he said:

"Every Senator knows that I was opposed to the war; but none knows but myself the depth of that opposition. With my conception of its character and consequences, it was impossible for me to vote for it."

And again, in 1848:

"But, after the war was declared, by authority of the Government, I acquiesced in what I could not prevent, and which it was impossible for me to arrest; and I then felt it to be my duty to limit my efforts to give such direction to the war as would, as far as possible, prevent the evils and dangers with which it threatened the country and its institutions."

Sir, I adopt all this as my own position and my defense; though, perhaps, in a civil war, I might fairly go further in opposition. I could not,

with my convictions, vote men and money for this war, and I would not, as a Representative, vote against them. I meant that, without opposition, the President might take all the men and all the money he should demand, and then to hold him to a strict accountability before the people for the results. Not believing the soldiers responsible for the war, or its purposes, or its consequences, I have never withheld my vote where their separate interests were concerned. But I have denounced from the beginning the usurpations and the infractions, one and all, of law and Constitution, by the President and those under him; their repeated and persistent arbitrary arrests, the suspension of *habeas corpus*, the violation of freedom of the mails, of the private house, of the press and of speech, and all the other multiplied wrongs and outrages upon public liberty and private right, which have made this country one of the worst despotisms on earth for the past twenty months; and I will continue to rebuke and denounce them to the end; and the people, thank God, have at last heard and heeded, and rebuked them, too. To the record and to time I appeal again for my justification.

And now, sir, I recur to the state of the Union to-day. What is it? Sir, twenty months have elapsed, but the rebellion is not crushed out; its military power has not been broken; the insurgents have not dispersed. The Union is not restored; nor the Constitution maintained; nor the laws enforced. Twenty, sixty, ninety, three hundred, six hundred days have passed; a thousand millions have been expended; and three hundred thousand lives lost or badly mangled; and to-day the confederate flag is still near the Potomac and the Ohio, and the confederate government stronger, many times, than at the beginning. Not a State has been restored, not any part of any State has voluntarily returned to the Union. And has anything been wanting that Congress, or the States, or the people in their most generous enthusiasm, their most impassioned patriotism, could bestow? Was it power? And did not the party of the executive control the entire Federal Government, every State government, every county, every city, town, and village in the North and West? Was it patronage? All belonged to it. Was it influence? What more? Did not the school, the college, the church, the press, the secret orders, the municipality, the corporation, railroads, telegraphs, express companies, the voluntary association, all, all yield it to the utmost? Was it unanimity? Never was an Administration so supported in England or America. Five men and half a score of newspapers made up the opposition. Was it enthusiasm? The enthusiasm was fanatical. There has been nothing like it since the Crusades. Was it confidence? Sir, the faith of the people exceeded that of the patriarch. They gave up Constitution, law, right, liberty, all at your demand for arbitrary power that the rebellion might, as you promised, be crushed out in three months and the Union restored. Was credit needed? You took control of a country, young, vigorous, and inexhaustible in wealth and resources, and of a Government almost free from public debt, and whose good faith had never been

tarnished. Your great national loan bubble failed miserably, as it deserved to fail; but the bankers and merchants of Philadelphia, New York, and Boston lent you more than their entire banking capital. And when that failed too, you forced credit by declaring your paper promises to pay a legal tender for all debts. Was money wanted? You had all the revenues of the United States, diminished indeed, but still in gold. The whole wealth of the country, to the last dollar, lay at your feet. Private individuals, municipal corporations, the State governments, all in their frenzy gave you money or means with reckless prodigality. The great eastern cities lent you \$150,000,000. Congress voted, first, \$250,000,000, and next \$500,000,000 more in loans; and then, first, \$50,000,000, then \$10,000,000, next \$90,000,000, and, in July last, \$150,000,000 in Treasury notes; and the Secretary has issued also a paper "postage currency," in sums as low as five cents, limited in amount only by his discretion. Nay, more; already since the 4th of July, 1861, this House has appropriated \$2,017,864,000, almost every dollar without debate, and without a recorded vote. A thousand millions have been expended since the 15th of April, 1861; and a public debt or liability of \$1,500,000,000 already incurred. And to support all this stupendous outlay and indebtedness, a system of taxation, direct and indirect, has been inaugurated, the most onerous and unjust ever imposed upon any but a conquered people.

Money and credit, then, you have had in prodigal profusion. And were men wanted? More than a million rushed to arms! Seventy-five thousand first, (and the country stood agast at the multitude,) then eighty-three thousand more were demanded; and three hundred and ten thousand responded to the call. The President next asked for four hundred thousand, and Congress, in its generous confidence, gave him five hundred thousand; and, not to be outdone, he took six hundred and thirty-seven thousand. Half of these melted away in their first campaign; and the President demanded three hundred thousand more for the war, and then drafted yet another three hundred thousand for nine months. The fabled hosts of Xerxes have been outnumbered. And yet victory strangely follows the standards of the foe. From Great Bethel to Vicksburg, the battle has not been to the strong. Yet every disaster, except the last, has been followed by a call for more troops, and every time so far they have been promptly furnished. From the beginning the war has been conducted like a political campaign, and it has been the folly of the party in power that they have assumed that numbers alone would win the field in a contest not with ballots but with musket and sword. But numbers you have had almost without number—the biggest, best appointed, best armed, fed, and clothed host of brave men, well organized and well drilled, ever marshaled. A Navy, too, not the most formidable perhaps, but the most numerous and gallant, and the costliest in the world, and again a fleet almost without a navy at all. Thus with twenty millions of people, and every element of strength and force at command—power, patronage, influence, unanimity, enthusiasm, confidence, credit, money, men, an Army and a Navy the largest and the

noblest ever set in the field or afloat upon the sea; with the support, almost servile, of every State, county, and municipality in the North and West; with a Congress swift to do the bidding of the Executive; without opposition anywhere at home, and with an arbitrary power which neither the Czar of Russia nor the Emperor of Austria dare exercise; yet after nearly two years of more vigorous prosecution of war than ever recorded in history; after more skirmishes, combats and battles than Alexander, Cæsar, or the first Napoleon ever fought in any five years of their military career, you have utterly, signally, disastrously—I will not say ignominiously—failed to subdue ten millions of “rebels,” whom you had taught the people of the North and West not only to hate but to despise. Rebels, did I say? Yes, your fathers were rebels, or your grandfathers. He who now before me on canvas looks down so sadly upon us, the false, degenerate, and imbecile guardians of the great Republic which he founded, was a rebel. And yet we, cradled ourselves in rebellion, and who have fostered and fraternized with every insurrection in the nineteenth century everywhere throughout the globe, would now, forsooth, make the word “rebel” a reproach. Rebels certainly they are; but all the persistent and stupendous efforts of the most gigantic warfare of modern times have, through your incompetency and folly, availed nothing to crush them out, cut off though they have been by your blockade from all the world, and dependent only upon their own courage and resources. And yet they were to be utterly conquered and subdued in six weeks, or three months! Sir, my judgment was made up and expressed from the first. I learned it from Chatham: “My lords, you cannot conquer America.” And you have not conquered the South. You never will. It is not in the nature of things possible: much less under your auspices. But money you have expended without limit, and blood poured out like water. Debt, debt, taxation, s-pulchres, these are your trophies. In vain the people gave you treasure and the soldier yielded up his life. “Fight, tax, emancipate, let these,” said the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. Pickens,] at the last session, “be the trinity of our salvation.” Sir, they have become the trinity of your deep damnation. The war for the Union is, in your hands, a most bloody and costly failure. The President confessed it on the 23d of September, solemnly, officially, and under the broad seal of the United States. And he has now repeated the confession. The priests and rabbis of abolition taught him that God would not prosper such a cause. War for the Union was abandoned; war for the negro openly begun, and with stronger battalions than before. With what success? Let the dead at Fredericksburg and Vicksburg answer.

And now, sir, can this war continue? Whence the money to carry it on? Where the men? Can you borrow? From whom? Can you tax more? Will the people bear it? Wait till you have collected what is already levied. How many millions more of “legal tender”—to-day forty-seven per cent. below the par of gold—can you float? Will men enlist now at any price? Ah, sir, it is

easier to die at home. I beg pardon; but I trust I am not “discouraging enlistments.” If I am, then first arrest Lincoln, Stanton, and Halleck, and some of your other generals; and I will retract; yes, I will recant. But can you draft again? Ask New England—New York. Ask Massachusetts. Where are the nine hundred thousand? Ask not Ohio—the Northwest. She thought you were in earnest, and gave you all, all—more than you demanded.

“The wife whose babe first smiled that day,
The fair, fond bride of yester eve,
And aged sire and maidron gray,
Saw the loved warriors haste away,
And deemed it sin to grieve.”

Sir, in blood she has atoned for her credulity; and now there is mourning in every house, and distress and sadness in every heart. Shall she give you any more?

But ought this war to continue? I answer, no—not a day, not an hour. What then? Shall we separate? Again I answer, no, no, no! What then? And now, sir, I come to the grandest and most solemn problem of statesmanship from the beginning of time; and to the God of Heaven, Illuminer of hearts and minds, I would humbly appeal for some measure, at least, of light and wisdom and strength to explore and reveal the dark but possible future of this land.

CAN THE UNION OF THESE STATES BE RESTORED?
HOW SHALL IT BE DONE?

And why not? Is it historically impossible? Sir, the frequent civil wars and conflicts between the States of Greece did not prevent their cordial union to resist the Persian invasion; nor did even the thirty years Peloponnesian war, springing, in part, from the abduction of slaves, and embittered and disastrous as it was—let Thucydides speak—wholly destroy the fellowship of those States. The wise Romans ended the three years social war after many bloody battles, and much atrocity, by admitting the States of Italy to all the rights and privileges of Roman citizenship—the very object to secure which these States had taken up arms. The border wars between Scotland and England, running through centuries, did not prevent the final union, in peace and by adjustment, of the two kingdoms under one monarch. Compromise did at last what ages of coercion and attempted conquest had failed to effect. England kept the crown, while Scotland gave the king to wear it; and the memories of Wallace and the Bruce of Bannockburn, became part of the glories of British history. I pass by the union of Ireland with England—a union of force, which God and just men abhor; and yet precisely “the Union as it should be” of the abolitionists of America. Sir, the rivalries of the houses of York and Lancaster filled all England with cruelty and slaughter; yet compromise and intermarriage ended the strife at last, and the white rose and the red were blended in one. Who dreamed a month before the death of Cromwell that in two years the people of England, after twenty years of civil war and usurpation, would, with great unanimity, restore the house of Stewart in the person of its most worthless prince, whose father but eleven years before they had beheaded? And who could have foretold in the

beginning of 1812, that within some three years, Napoleon would be in exile upon a desert island, and the Bourbons restored? Armed foreign intervention did it; but it is a strange history. Or who then expected to see a nephew of Napoleon, thirty-five years later, with the consent of the people, supplant the Bourbon and reign Emperor of France? Sir, many States and people, once separate, have become united in the course of ages through natural causes and without conquest; but I remember a single instance only in history, of States or people once united, and speaking the same language, who have been forced permanently asunder by civil strife or war, unless they were separated by distance or vast natural boundaries. The secession of the Ten Tribes is the exception these parted without actual war; and their subsequent history is not encouraging to secession. But when Moses, the greatest of all statesmen, would secure a distinct nationality and government to the Hebrews, he left Egypt and established his people in a distant country. In modern times, the Netherlands, three centuries ago, won their independence by the sword; but France and the English Channel separated them from Spain. So did our Thirteen Colonies; but the Atlantic ocean divorced us from England. So did Mexico, and other Spanish colonies in America; but the same ocean divided them from Spain. Cuba and the Canadas still adhere to the parent Government. And who now, North or South, in Europe or America, looking into history, shall presumptuously say that because of civil war the reunion of these States is impossible? War, indeed, while it lasts, is disunion, and, if it lasts long enough, will be final, eternal separation first, and anarchy and despotism afterward. Hence I would hasten peace now, to-day, by every honorable appliance.

Are there physical causes which render reunion impracticable? None. Where other causes do not control, rivers unite; but mountains, deserts, and great bodies of water—*oceanic dissociabiles*—separate a people. Vast forests originally, and the lakes now, also divide us—not very widely or wholly—from the Canadas, though we speak the same language, and are similar in manners, laws, and institutions. Our chief navigable rivers run from North to South. Most of our bays and arms of the sea take the same direction. So do our ranges of mountains. Natural causes all tend to Union, except as between the Pacific coast and the country east of the Rocky mountains to the Atlantic. It is "manifest destiny." Union is empire. Hence, hitherto we have continually extended our territory, and the Union with it, South and West. The Louisiana purchase, Florida, and Texas all attest it. We passed desert and forest, and scaled even the Rocky mountains, to extend the Union to the Pacific. Sir, there is no natural boundary between the North and the South, and no line of latitude upon which to separate; and if ever a line of longitude shall be established, it will be east of the Mississippi valley. The Alleghenies are no longer a barrier. Highways ascend them everywhere, and the rail and now climbs their summits and spans their chasms, or penetrates their rockiest sides. The electric telegraph follows, and, stretching its connecting

wires along the clouds, there mingles its vocal lightnings with the fires of heaven.

But if disunionists in the East will force a separation of any of these States, and a boundary purely conventional, is at last to be marked out, it must and it will be either from Lake Erie upon the shortest line to the Ohio river, or from Manhattan to the Canadas.

And, now, sir, is there any difference of race here, so radical as to forbid reunion? I do not refer to the negro race, styled now, in unctuous official phrase by the President, "Americans of African descent." Certainly, sir, there are two white races in the United States, both from the same common stock, and yet so distinct—one of them so peculiar—that they develop different forms of civilization, and might belong, almost, to different types of mankind. But the boundary of these two races is not at all marked by the line which divides the slaveholding from the non-slaveholding States. If race is to be the geographical limit of disunion, then Mason and Dixon's can never be the line.

Next, sir, do not the causes which, in the beginning, impelled to Union still exist in their utmost force and extent? What were they?

First, the common descent—and therefore consanguinity—of the great mass of the people from the Anglo-Saxon stock. Had the Canadas been settled originally by the English, they would doubtless have followed the fortunes of the thirteen colonies. Next, a common language, one of the strongest of the ligaments which bind a people. Had we been contiguous to Great Britain, either the causes which led to a separation would have never existed, or else been speedily removed; or, afterwards, we would long since have been reunited as equals and with all the rights of Englishmen. And along with these were similar, at least not essentially dissimilar, manners, habits, laws, religion, and institutions of all kinds, except one. The common defense was another powerful incentive, and is named in the Constitution as one among the objects of the "more perfect Union" of 1787. Stronger yet than all these, perhaps, but made up of all of them, was a common interest. Variety of climate and soil, and therefore of production, implying also extent of country, is not an element of separation, but, added to contiguity, becomes a part of the ligament of interest, and is one of its toughest strands. Variety of production is the parent of the earliest commerce and trade; and these, in their full development, are, as between foreign nations, hostages for peace; and between States and people united, they are the firmest bonds of Union. But, after all, the strongest of the many original impelling causes to the Union, was the securing of domestic tranquility. The statesmen of 1787 well knew that between thirteen independent but contiguous States without a natural boundary, and with nothing to separate them except the machinery of similar governments, there must be a perpetual, in fact an "irrepressible conflict" of jurisdiction and interest, which, there being no other common arbiter, could only be terminated by the conflict of the sword. And the statesmen of 1862 ought to know that two or more confederate governments, made up of

similar States, having no natural boundary either, and separated only by different governments, cannot endure long together in peace, unless one or more of them be either too pusillanimous for rivalry, or too insignificant to provoke it, or too weak to resist aggression.

These, sir, along with the establishment of justice, and the securing of the general welfare, and of the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity, made up the causes and motives which impelled our fathers to the Union at first.

And now, sir, what one of them is wanting? What one diminished? On the contrary, many of them are stronger to-day than in the beginning. Migration and intermarriage have strengthened the ties of consanguinity. Commerce, trade, and production have immensely multiplied. Cotton, almost unknown here in 1787, is now the chief product and export of the country. It has set in motion three fourths of the spindles of New England, and given employment, directly or remotely, to full half the shipping, trade, and commerce of the United States. More than that: cotton has kept the peace between England and America for thirty years; and had the people of the North been as wise and practical as the statesmen of Great Britain, it would have maintained Union and peace here. But we are being taught in our first century and at our own cost, the lessons which England learned through the long and bloody experience of eight hundred years. We shall be wiser next time. Let not cotton be king, but peace-maker, and inherit the blessing.

A common interest, then, still remains to us. And union for the common defense, at the end of this war, taxed, indebted, impoverished, exhausted, as both sections must be, and with foreign fleets and armies around us, will be fifty-fold more essential than ever before. And finally, sir, without union, our domestic tranquillity must forever remain unsettled. If it cannot be maintained within the Union, how then outside of it, without an exodus or colonization of the people of one section or the other to a distant country? Sir, I repeat that two governments so interlinked and bound together every way by physical and social ligaments, cannot exist in peace without a common arbiter. Will treaties bind us? What better treaty than the Constitution? What more solemn, more durable? Shall we settle our disputes, then, by arbitration and compromise? Sir, let us arbitrate and compromise now, inside of the Union. Certainly it will be quite as easy.

And now, sir, to all these original causes and motives which impelled to union at first, must be added certain artificial ligaments, which eighty years of association under a common Government have most fully developed. Chief among these are canals, steam navigation, railroads, express companies, the post office, the newspaper press, and that terrible agent of good and evil mixed—"spirit of health, and yet goblin damned"—if free, the gentlest minister of truth and liberty; when enslaved, the supplest instrument of falsehood and tyranny—the magnetic telegraph. All these have multiplied the speed or the quantity of trade, travel, communication, migration, and intercourse of all kinds between the different States

and sections; and thus, so long as a healthy condition of the body-politic continued, they became powerful cementing agencies of union. The numerous voluntary associations, artistic, literary, charitable, social, and scientific, until corrupted and made fanatical; the various ecclesiastical organizations, until they divided; and the political parties, so long as they remained all national and not sectional, were also among the strong ties which bound us together. And yet all of these, perverted and abused for some years in the hands of bad or fanatical men, became still more powerful instrumentalities in the fatal work of disunion; just as the veins and arteries of the human body, designed to convey the vitalizing fluid through every part of it, will carry also, and with increased rapidity it may be, the subtle poison which takes life away. Nor is this all. It was through their agency that the imprisoned winds of civil war were all let loose at first with such sudden and appalling fury; and, kept in motion by political power, they have ministered to that fury ever since. But, potent alike for good and evil, they may yet, under the control of the people, and in the hands of wise, good, and patriotic men, be made the most effective agencies, under Providence, in the reunion of these States.

Other ties also, less material in their nature, but hardly less persuasive in their influence, have grown up under the Union. Long association, a common history, national reputation, treaties and diplomatic intercourse abroad, admission of new States, a common jurisprudence, great men whose names and fame are the patrimony of the whole country, patriotic music and songs, common battle-fields, and glory won under the same flag. These make up the poetry of Union; and yet, as in the marriage relation, and the family with similar influences, they are stronger than hooks of steel. He was a wise statesman, though he may never have held an office, who said, "Let me write the songs of a people, and I care not who makes their laws." Why is the Marseillaise prohibited in France? Sir, Hail Columbia and the Star Spangled Banner—Pennsylvania gave us one, and Maryland the other—have done more for the Union than all the legislation and all the debates in this Capitol for forty years; and they will do more yet again than all your armies, though you call out another million of men into the field. Sir, I would add "Yankee Doodle;" but first let me be assured that Yankee Doodle loves the Union more than he hates the slaveholder.*

And now, sir, I propose to briefly consider the causes which led to disunion and the present civil war; and to inquire whether they are eternal and ineradicable in their nature, and at the same time powerful enough to overcome all the causes and considerations which impel to reunion.

Having two years ago discussed fully and elaborately the more abstruse and remote causes whence civil commotions in all Governments, and those also which are peculiar to our complex and Federal system, such as the consolidating tendencies of the General Government, because of ex-

* In truth, the song was written in derision, by a British officer, and not by an American.

utive power and patronage, and of the tariff, and taxation and disbursement generally, all unjust and burdensome to the West equally with the South, I pass them by now.

What, then, I ask, is the immediate, direct cause of disunion and this civil war? Slavery, it is answered. Sir, that is the philosophy of the rustic in the play—"that a great cause of the night, is lack of the sun." Certainly slavery was in one sense—very obscure indeed—the cause of the war. Had there been no slavery here, this particular war about slavery would never have been waged. In a like sense, the Holy Sepulcher was the cause of the war of the Crusades; and had Troy or Carthage never existed, there never would have been Trojan or Carthaginian war, and no such personages as Hector and Hannibal; and no Iliad or Æneid would ever have been written. But far better say that the negro is the cause of the war; for had there been no negro here, there would be no war just now. What then? Exterminate him? Who demands it? Colonize him? How? Where? When? At whose cost? Sir, let us have an end of this folly.

But slavery is the cause of the war. Why? Because the South obstinately and wickedly refused to restrict or abolish it at the demand of the philosophers or fanatics and demagogues of the North and West. Then, sir, it was abolition, the purpose to abolish or interfere with and him in slavery, which caused disunion and war. Slavery is only the *subject*, but abolition the *cause*, of this civil war. It was the persistent and determined agitation in the free States of the question of abolishing slavery in the South, because of the alleged "irrepressible conflict" between the forms of labor in the two sections, or in the false and mischievous *cost* of the day, between freedom and slavery, that forced a collision of arms at last. Sir, that conflict was not confined to the Territories. It was expressly proclaimed by its apostles, as between the States also, against the institution of domestic slavery everywhere. But, assuming the platforms of the Republican party as the standard, and stating the case most strongly in favor of that party, it was the refusal of the South to consent that slavery should be excluded from the Territories that led to the continued agitation, North and South, of that question, and finally to disunion and civil war. Sir, I will not be answered now by the old clamor about "the aggressions of the slave power." That miserable specter, that unreal mockery, has been exorcised and expelled by debt and taxation and blood. If that power did govern this country for the sixty years preceding this terrible revolution, then the sooner this Administration and Government return to the principles and policy of southern statesmanship, the better for the country; and that, sir, is already, or soon will be, the judgment of the people. But I deny that it was the "slave power" that governed for so many years, and so wisely and well. It was the Democratic party, and its principles and policy, molded and controlled, indeed, largely by southern statesmen. Neither will I be stopped by that other cry of mingled fanaticism and hypocrisy, about the sin and barbarism of African slavery. Sir, I see

more of barbarism and sin, a thousand times, in the continuance of this war, the dissolution of the Union, the breaking up of this Government, and the enslavement of the white race by debt and taxes and arbitrary power. The day of fanatics and sophists and enthusiasts, thank God, is gone at last; and though the age of chivalry may not, the age of practical statesmanship is about to return. Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African." And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been best secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to-day in the West than there was two years ago; and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of morals, or religion, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned, or begun to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation, and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be "pro-slaveryism," if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our own midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, an anti-slavery paper in New York, (the Tribune,) the most influential, and, therefore, most dangerous of all of that class—it would exhibit more of dignity, and command more of influence, if it were always to discuss public questions and public men with a decent respect—lying aside now the epithets of "secessionist" and "traitor," has returned to its ancient political nomenclature, and calls certain members of this House "pro-slavery." Well, sir, in the old sense of the term as applied to the Democratic party, I will not object. I said years ago, and it is a fitting time now to repeat it:

"It is to love my country; to cherish the Union; to reverse the Constitution; to do honor to the millions and tens of millions who would flit up a creditous hand against either; if I could but in the past, to believe it in the present, to believe it in the future of this land, which is of more value to us and to the world for ages to come than all the material riches which have descended upon man, the common to that day—let this it is to be pro-slavery, that is every nerve, fiber, vein, bone, tendon, joint, and ligament, from the thinnest hair of his head to the last extremity of his foot, I am all over and altogether a pro-slavery man."

And now, sir, I come to the great and controlling

question within which the whole issue of union or disunion is bound up: is there "an irrepressible conflict" between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States? Must "the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana," in the language of Mr. Seward, "be ultimately tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men?" If so, then there is an end of all union and forever. You cannot abolish slavery by the sword; still less by proclamations, though the President were to "proclaim" every month. Of what possible avail was his proclamation of September? Did the South submit? Was she even alarmed? And yet he has now fulminated another "bull against the comet"—*brutum fulmen*—and, threatening servile insurrection with all its horrors, has yet coolly appealed to the judgment of mankind, and invoked the blessing of the God of peace and love! But declaring it a military necessity, an essential measure of war to subdue the rebels, yet, with admirable wisdom, he expressly exempts from its operation the only States and parts of States in the South where he has the military power to execute it.

Neither, sir, can you abolish slavery by argument. As well attempt to abolish marriage or the relation of paternity. The South is resolved to maintain it at every hazard and by every sacrifice; and if "this Union cannot endure part slave and part free," then it is already and finally dissolved. Talk not to me of "West Virginia." Tell me not of Missouri, trampled under the feet of your soldiery. As well talk to me of Ireland. Sir, the destiny of those States must abide the issue of the war. But Kentucky you may find tougher. And Maryland—

"E'en in her ashes live their wonted fires."

Nor will Delaware be found wanting in the day of trial.

But I deny the doctrine. It is full of disunion and civil war. It is disunion itself. Whoever first taught it ought to be dealt with as not only hostile to the Union, but an enemy of the human race. Sir, the fundamental idea of the Constitution is the perfect and eternal compatibility of a union of States "part slave and part free;" else the Constitution never would have been framed, nor the Union founded; and seventy years of successful experiment have approved the wisdom of the plan. In my deliberate judgment, a confederacy made up of slaveholding and non-slaveholding States is, in the nature of things, the strongest of all popular governments. African slavery has been, and is, eminently conservative. It makes the absolute political equality of the white race everywhere practicable. It dispenses with the English order of nobility, and leaves every white man, North and South, owning slaves or owning none, the equal of every other white man. It has reconciled universal suffrage throughout the free States with the stability of government.

I speak not now of its material benefits to the North and West, which are many and more obvious. But the South, too, has profited many ways by a union with the non-slaveholding States. Enterprise, industry, self-reliance, perseverance, and the other hardy virtues of a people living in a higher latitude and without hereditary servants, she has learned or received from the North. Sir, it is easy, I know, to denounce all this, and to revile him who utters it. Be it so. The English is, of all languages, the most copious in words of bitterness and reproach. "Pour on: I will endure."

Then, sir, there is not an "irrepressible conflict" between slave labor and free labor. There is no conflict at all. Both exist together in perfect harmony in the South. The master and the slave, the white laborer and the black, work together in the same field or the same shop, and without the slightest sense of degradation. They are not equals, either socially or politically. And why not, then, cannot Ohio, having only free labor, live in harmony with Kentucky which has both slave and free? Above all, why cannot Massachusetts allow the same right of choice to South Carolina, separated as they are a thousand miles, by other States who would keep the peace and live in good will? Why this civil war? Whence disunion? Not from slavery—not because the South chooses to have two kinds of labor instead of one; but from sectionalism, always and everywhere a disintegrating principle. Sectional jealousy and hate—these, sir, are the only elements of conflict between these States, and though powerful, they are yet not at all irrepressible. They exist between families, communities, towns, cities, counties, and States; and if not repressed would dissolve all society and government. They exist also between other sections than the North and South. Sectionalism East, many years ago, saw the South and West united by the ties of geographical position, migration, intermarriage, and interest, and thus strong enough to control the power and policy of the Union. It found us divided only by different forms of labor; and, with consummate but most guilty sagacity, it seized upon the question of slavery as the surest and most powerful instrumentality by which to separate the West from the South, and bind her wholly to the North. Encouraged every way from abroad by those who were jealous of our prosperity and greatness, and who knew the secret of our strength, it proclaimed the "irrepressible conflict" between slave labor and free labor. It taught the people of the North to forget both their duty and their interests; and aided by the artificial ligaments and influence which money and enterprise had created between the sea-board and the North-west, it persuaded the people of that section, also, to yield up every tie which binds them to the great valley of the Mississippi, and to join their political fortunes especially, wholly, with the East. It resisted the fugitive slave law, and demanded the exclusion of slavery from all the Territories and from this District, and clamored against the admission of any more slave States into the Union. It organized a sectional anti-slavery party, and thus drew to its aid as well political ambition and interest as fanaticism; and after twenty-five

years of incessant and vehement agitation, it obtained possession finally, and upon that issue, of the Federal Government and of every State government North and West. And to-day, we are in the midst of the greatest, most cruel, most destructive civil war ever waged. But two years, sir, of blood and debt and taxation and incipient commercial ruin are teaching the people of the West, and I trust of the North also, the folly and madness of this crusade against African slavery, and the wisdom and necessity of a union of the States, as our fathers made it, "part slave and part free."

What, then, sir, with so many causes impelling to reunion, keeps us apart to-day? Hate, passion, antagonism, revenge, all heated seven times hotter by war. Sir, these, while they last, are the most powerful of all motives with a people, and with the individual man; but fortunately they are the least durable. They hold a divided sway in the same bosoms with the nobler qualities of love, justice, reason, placability; and, except when at their height, are weaker than the sense of interest, and always, in States at least, give way to it at last. No statesman who yields himself up to them can govern wisely or well; and no State whose policy is controlled by them can either prosper or endure. But war is both their offspring and their aliment, and while it lasts, all other motives are subordinate. The virtues of peace cannot flourish, cannot even find development in the midst of fighting; and this civil war keeps in motion the centrifugal forces of the Union, and gives to them increased strength and activity every day. But such, and so many and powerful, in my judgment, are the cementing or centripetal agencies impelling us together that nothing but perpetual war and strife can keep us always divided.

Sir, I do not under-estimate the power of the prejudices of section, or, what is much stronger, of race. Prejudice is colder, and, therefore, more durable than the passions of hate and revenge, or the spirit of antagonism. But, as I have already said, its boundary in the United States is not Mason and Dixon's line. The long standing mutual jealousies of New England and the South do not primarily grow out of slavery. They are deeper, and will always be the chief obstacle in the way of full and absolute reunion. They are founded in difference of manners, habits, and social life, and different notions about politics, morals, and religion. Sir, after all, this whole war is not so much one of sections—least of all between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding sections—as of races, representing not difference in blood, but mind and its development, and different types of civilization. It is the old conflict of the Cavalier and the Roundhead, the Liberalist and the Puritan; or rather it is a conflict upon new issues, of the ideas and elements represented by those names. It is a war of the Yankee and the Southerner. Said a Boston writer the other day, eulogizing a New England officer who fell at Fredericksburg: "This is Massachusetts's war; Massachusetts and South Carolina made it." But in the beginning, the Roundhead outwitted the Cavalier, and by a skillful rise of slavery and the negro united all New England first, and after-

ward the entire North and West, and finally sent out to battle against him Celt and Saxon, German and Knickerbocker, Catholic and Episcopalian, and even a part of his own household and of the descendants of his own stock. Said Mr. Jefferson, when New England threatened secession some sixty years ago: "No, let us keep the Yankees to quarrel with." Ah, sir, he forgot that quarreling is always a hazardous experiment; and after some time, the countrymen of Adams proved themselves too sharp at that work for the countrymen of Jefferson. But every day the contest now tends again to its natural and original elements. In many parts of the Northwest—I might add of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York city—the prejudice against the "Yankee" has always been almost as bitter as in the South. Suppressed for a little while by the anti-slavery sentiment and the war, it threatens now to break forth in one of those great but unfortunate popular uprisings, in the midst of which reason and justice are for the time utterly silenced. I speak advisedly; and let New England heed, else she, and the whole East, too, in their struggle for power, may learn yet from the West the same lesson which civil war taught to Rome, that *evulgato imperii arcano, posse principem alibi, quam Roma fieri*. The people of the West demand peace, and they begin to more than suspect that New England is in the way. The storm rages; and they believe that she, not slavery, is the cause. The ship is sore tried; and passengers and crew are now almost ready to propitiate the waves by throwing the ill-omened prophet overboard. In plain English—not very classic, but most expressive—they threaten to "set New England out in the cold."

And now, sir, I, who have not a drop of New England blood in my veins, but was born in Ohio, and am wholly of southern ancestry—with a slight cross of Pennsylvania Scotch-Irish—would speak a word to the men of the West and the South, in behalf of New England. Sir, some years ago, in the midst of high sectional controversies, and speaking as a western man, I said some things harsh of the North, which now, in a more catholic spirit as a United States man, and for the sake of reunion, I would recall. My prejudices, indeed, upon this subject are as strong as any man's; but in this, the day of great national humiliation and calamity, let the voice of prejudice be hushed.

Sir, they who would exclude New England in any reconstruction of the Union, assume that all New Englanders are "Yankees" and Puritans; and that the Puritan or pragmatical element, or type of civilization, has always held undisputed sway. Well, sir, Yankees, certainly, they are in one sense; and so to Old England we are all Yankees, North and South; and to the South just now, or a little while ago, we of the middle and western States, also, are, or were, Yankees, too. But there is really a very large, and most liberal and conservative non-Puritan element in the population of New England, which, for many years, struggled for the mastery, and sometimes held it. It divided Maine, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and once controlled Rhode Island wholly. It held the sway during the Revolution, and at the period when the

Constitution was founded, and for some years afterward. Mr. Calhoun said very justly, in 1847, that to the wisdom and enlarged patriotism of Sherman and Ellsworth on the slavery question we were indebted for this admirable Government; and that, along with Paterson, of New Jersey, "their names ought to be engraven on brass, and live forever." And Mr. Webster, in 1830, in one of those grand historic word-paintings, in which he was so great a master, said of Massachusetts and South Carolina: "Hand in hand they stood around the Administration of Washington, and felt his own great arm lean on them for support." Indeed, sir, it was not till some thirty years ago that the narrow, presumptuous, intermeddling, and fanatical spirit of the old Puritan element began to reappear in a form very much more aggressive and destructive than at first, and threatened to obtain absolute mastery in church, and school, and State. A little earlier it had struggled hard, but the conservatives proved too strong for it; and so long as the great statesmen and jurists of the Whig and Democratic parties survived, it made small progress, though John Quincy Adams gave to it the strength of his great name. But after their death it broke in as a flood, and swept away the last vestige of the ancient, liberal, and tolerating conservatism. Then every form and development of fanaticism sprang up in rank and most luxuriant growth, till abolitionism, the chieffungus of all, overpread the whole of New England first, and then the middle States, and finally every State in the Northwest.

Certainly, sir, the more liberal or non-Puritan element was mainly, though not altogether, from the old Puritan stock, or largely crossed with it. But even within the first ten years after the landing of the Pilgrims, a more enlarged and tolerating civilization was introduced. Roger Williams, not of the Mayflower, though a Puritan himself, and thoroughly imbued with all its peculiarities of cant and creed and form of worship, seems yet to have had naturally a more liberal spirit; and, first perhaps of all men, some three or more years before the Ark and the Dove touched the shores of the St. Mary's, in Maryland, taught the sublime doctrine of freedom of opinion and practice in religion. Threatened first with banishment to England, so as to "remove as far as possible the infection of his principles;" and afterwards actually banished beyond the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, because, in the language of the sentence of the General Court, "he broached and divulged divers new and strange doctrines against the authority of magistrates" over the religious opinions of men, thereby disturbing the peace of the colony, he became the founder of Rhode Island, and, indeed, of a large part of New England society. And, whether from his teaching and example, and in the persons of his descendants and those of his associates, or from other causes and another stock, there has always been a large infusion throughout New England of what may be called the *Roger Williams element*, as distinguished from the extreme Puritan or *Mayflower* and *Plymouth Rock* type of the New Englander; and its influence, till late years, has always been powerful.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's hour has expired.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. I ask for a short time longer.

Mr. POTTER. I hope there will be no objection from this side of the House.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the gentleman will be allowed further time.

There was no objection; and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM. Sir, I would not deny or disparage the austere virtues of the old Puritans of England or America. But I do believe that, in the very nature of things, no community could exist long in peace, and no Government endure long alone, or become great, where that element in its earliest or its more recent form holds supreme control. And it is my solemn conviction that there can be no possible or durable reunion of these States until it shall have been again subordinated to other and more liberal and conservative elements, and, above all, until its worst and most mischievous development, abolitionism, has been utterly extinguished. Sir, the peace of the Union and of this continent demands it. But, fortunately, those very elements exist abundantly in New England herself; and to her I look with confidence to secure to them the mastery within her limits. In fact, sir, the true voice of New England has for some years past been but rarely heard here or elsewhere in public affairs. Men now control her politics and are in high places, State and Federal, who, twenty years ago, could not have been chosen selectmen in old Massachusetts. But let her remember at last her ancient renown; let her turn from vain-glorious admiration of the stone monuments of her heroes and patriots of a former age, to generous emulation of the noble and manly virtues which they were designed to commemorate. Let us hear less from her of the Pilgrim Fathers and the Mayflower and of Plymouth Rock, and more of Roger Williams and his compatriots, and his toleration. Let her banish now and forever her dreamers and her sophists and her fanatics, and call back again into her State administration and into the national councils "her men of might, her grand in soul"—some of them still live—and she will yet escape the dangers which now threaten her with isolation.

Then, sir, while I am inexorably hostile to Puritan domination in religion or morals or literature or politics, I am not in favor of the proposed exclusion of New England. I would have the Union as it was; and first, New England as she was. But if New England will have no union with slaveholders; if she is not content with "the Union as it was," then upon her own head be the responsibility for secession. And there will be no more coercion now. I, at least, will be exactly consistent.

And now, sir, can the central States, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, consent to separation? Can New York city? Sir, the trade of the South made her largely what she is. She was the factor and banker of the South—cotton filled her harbor with shipping and her banks with gold. But in an evil hour the foolish, I will not say bad, "men of Gotham" persuaded her mer-

chant princes—against their first lesson in business—that she could retain or force back the southern trade by war. War, indeed, has given her, just now, a new business and trade greater and more profitable than the old. But with disunion that, too, must perish. And let not Wall street, or any other great interest, mercantile, manufacturing, or commercial, imagine that it shall have power enough or wealth enough to stand in the way of reunion through peace. Let them learn, one and all, that a public man who has the people as his support, is stronger than they, though he may not be worth a million, nor even one dollar. A little while ago the banks said that they were king, but President Jackson speedily taught them their mistake. Next, railroads assumed to be king; and cotton once vaunted largely his kingship. Sir, these are only of the royal family—princes of the blood. There is but one king on earth. Politics is king.

But to return: New Jersey, too, is bound closely to the South, and the South to her; and more and longer than any other State, she remembered both her duty to the Constitution and her interest in the Union. And Pennsylvania, a sort of middle ground, just between the North and the South, and extending, also, to the West, is united by nearer, if not stronger ties, to every section, than any other one State, unless it be Ohio. She was—she is yet—the keystone in the great but now crumbling arch of the Union. She is a border State; and, more than that, she has less within her of the fanciful or disturbing element than any of the States. The people of Pennsylvania are quiet, peaceable, practical, and enterprising, without being aggressive. They have more of the honest old English and German thrift than any other. No people mind more diligently their own business. They have but one idiosyncrasy or speciality—the tariff; and even that is really far more a matter of tradition than of substantial interest. The industry, enterprise, and thrift of Pennsylvania are abundantly able to take care of themselves against any competition. In any event, the Union is of more value, many times, to her than any local interest.

But other ties also bind these States—Pennsylvania and New Jersey, especially—to the South, and the South to them. Only an imaginary line separates the former from Delaware and Maryland. The Delaware river, common to both Pennsylvania and New Jersey, flows into Delaware bay. The Susquehanna empties its waters, through Pennsylvania and Maryland, into the Chesapeake. And that great watershed itself, extending to Norfolk, and, therefore, almost to the North Carolina line, does belong, and must ever belong, in common to the central and southern States, under one Government; or else the line of separation will be the Potomac to its head waters. All of Delaware and Maryland, and the counties of Accomac and Northampton, in Virginia, would, in that event, follow the fortunes of the northern confederacy. In fact, sir, disagreeable as the idea may be to many within their limits on both sides, no man who looks at the map and then reflects upon history and the force of natural causes, and considers the present actual and the future proba-

ble position of the hostile armies and navies at the end of this war, ought for a moment to doubt that either the States and counties which I have named must go with the North, or Pennsylvania and New Jersey with the South. Military force on either side cannot control the destiny of the States lying between the mouth of the Chesapeake and the Hudson. And if that bay were itself made the line, Delaware, and the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia, would belong to the North; while Norfolk, the only capacious harbor on the southeastern coast, must be commanded by the guns of some new fortress upon Cape Charles; and Baltimore, the now queenly city, seated then upon the very boundary of two rival, yes, hostile, confederacies, would rapidly fall into decay.

And now, sir, I will not ask whether the North-west can consent to separation from the South. Never. Nature forbids. We are only a part of the great valley of the Mississippi. There is no line of latitude upon which to separate. Neither party would desire the old line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ on both sides of the river; and there is no natural boundary east and west. The nearest to it are the Ohio and Missouri rivers. But that line would leave Cincinnati and St. Louis, as border cities, like Baltimore, to decay, and, extending fifteen hundred miles in length, would become the scene of an eternal border warfare without example even in the worst of times. Sir, we cannot, ought not, will not, separate from the South. And if you of the East who have found this war against the South and for the negro, gratifying to your hate or profitable to your purse, will continue it till a separation be forced between the slaveholding and your non-slaveholding States, then, believe me, and accept it, as you did not the other solemn warnings of years past, *the day which divides the North from the South, that self-same day decrees eternal divorce between the West and the East.*

Sir, our destiny is fixed. There is not one drop of rain which descending from the heavens, and fertilizing our soil, causes it to yield an abundant harvest, but flows into the Mississippi, and there, mingling with the waters of that mighty river, finds its way, at last, to the Gulf of Mexico. And we must and will follow it with travel and trade, not by treaty but by right, freely, peaceably, and without restriction or tribute, under the same Government and flag, to its home in the bosom of that Gulf. Sir, we will not remain after separation from the South, a province or appanage of the East, to bear her burdens and pay her taxes: nor hemmed in and isolated as we are, and without a sea-coast, could we long remain a distinct confederacy. But wherever we go, married to the South or the East, we bring with us three fourths of the territories of that valley to the Rocky mountains, and it may be to the Pacific—the grandest and most magnificent dowry that bride ever had to bestow.

Then, sir, New England, freed at last from the domination of her sophisters, dreamers and bigots, and restored to the control once more of her former liberal, tolerant, and conservative civilization, will not stand in the way of the reunion of these States upon terms of fair and honorable adjustment. And in this great work the

and border slave States, too, will unite heart and hand. To the West, it is a necessity, and she demands it. And let not the States now called confederate insist upon separation and independence. What did they demand at first? Security against abolitionism within the Union. Protection from "the irrepressible conflict" and the domination of the absolute numerical majority. A change of public opinion, and consequently of political parties in the North and West, so that their local institutions and domestic peace should no longer be endangered. And, now, sir, after two years of persistent and most gigantic effort on the part of this Administration to compel them to submit, but with utter and signal failure, the people of the free States are now or are fast becoming satisfied that the price of the Union is the utter suppression of abolitionism or anti-slavery as a political element, and the complete subordination of the spirit of fanaticism and intermeddling which gave it birth. In any event, they are ready now, if I have not greatly misread the signs of the times, to return to the old constitutional and actual basis of fifty years ago—three fifths rule of representation, speedy return of fugitives from labor, equal rights in the Territories, no more slavery agitation anywhere, and transit and temporary sojourn with slaves, without molestation, in the free States. Without all the so there could be neither peace nor permanence to a restored union of States "part slave and part free." With it, the South, in addition to all the other great and multiplied benefits of union, would be far more secure in her slave property, her domestic institutions, than under a separate government. Sir, let no man North or West, tell me that this would perpetuate African slavery. I know it. But so does the Constitution. I repeat, sir, it is the price of the Union. Whoever hates negro slavery more than he loves the Union, must demand separation at last. I think that you can never abolish slavery by fighting. Certainly you never can till you have first destroyed the South, and then, in the language, first of Mr. Douglas and afterwards of Mr. Seward, converted this Government into an imperial despotism. And, sir, whenever I am forced to a choice between the loss to my own country and race, of personal and political liberty with all its blessings, and the involuntary domestic servitude of the negro, I shall not hesitate one moment to choose the latter alternative. The sole question to-day is between the Union with slavery, or final disunion, and, I think, anarchy and despotism. I am for the Union. It was good enough for my fathers. It is good enough for us and our children after us.

And, sir, let no man in the South tell me that she has been invaded, and that all the horrors implied in those most terrible of words, civil war, have been visited upon her. I know that, too. But we, also, of the North and West, in every State and by thousands, who have dared so much as to question the principles and policy, or doubt the honesty, of this Administration and its party, have suffered everything that the worst despotism could inflict, except only loss of life itself upon the scaffold. Some even have died for the cause by the hand of the assassin. And can we forget? Never, never. Time will but burn the memory

of these wrongs deeper into our hearts. But shall we break up the Union? Shall we destroy the Government because usurping tyrants have held possession and perverted it to the most cruel of oppressions? Was it ever so done in any other country? In Athens? Rome? England? Anywhere? No, sir; let us expel the usurper, and restore the Constitution and laws, the rights of the States, and the liberties of the people; and then, in the country of our fathers, under the Union of our fathers, and the old flag—the symbol once again of the free and the brave—let us fulfill the grand mission which Providence has appointed for us among the nations of the earth.

And now, sir, if it be the will of all sections to unite, then upon what terms? Sir, between the South and most of the States of the North, and all of the West, there is but one subject in controversy—slavery. It is the only question, said Mr. Calhoun twenty-five years ago, of sufficient magnitude and potency to divide this Union; and divide it it will, he added, or drench the country in blood if not arrested. It has done both. But settle it on the original basis of the Constitution, and give to each section the power to protect itself within the Union, and now, after the terrible lessons of the past two years, the Union will be stronger than before, and, indeed, endure for ages. Woe to the man, North or South, who, to the third or the fourth generation, should teach men disunion.

And now the way to reunion: what so easy? Behold to-day two separate governments in one country, and without a natural dividing line; with two presidents and cabinets, and a double Congress; and yet each under a constitution so exactly similar, the one to the other, that a stranger could scarce discern the difference. Was ever folly and madness like this? Sir, it is not in the nature of things that it should so continue long.

But why speak of ways or terms of reunion now? The will is yet wanting in both sections. Union is consent and good will and fraternal affection. War is force, hate, revenge. Is the country tired at last of war? Has the experiment been tried long enough? Has sufficient blood been shed, treasure expended, and misery inflicted in both the North and the South? What then? Stop fighting. Make an armistice—no formal treaty. Withdraw your army from the seceded States. Reduce both armies to a fair and sufficient peace establishment. Declare absolute free trade between the North and South. Buy and sell. Agree upon a Zollverein. Recall your fleets. Break up your blockade. Reduce your navy. Restore travel. Open up railroads. Re-establish the telegraph. Reunite your express companies. No more Monitors and iron-clads, but set your friendly steamers and ironships again in motion. Visit the North and West. Visit the South. Exchange newspapers. Migrate. Intermarry. Let slavery alone. Hold elections at the appointed times. Let us choose a new President in sixty-four. And when the gospel of peace shall have descended again from heaven into their hearts, and the gospel of abolition and of hate been expelled, let your clergy

subjects in controversy be referred to Switzerland, or Russia, or any other impartial and incorruptible Power or State in Europe. But at last, sir, the people of these several States here, at home, must be the final arbiters of this great quarrel in America; and the people and States of the Northwest, the mediators who shall stand, like the prophet, between the living and the dead, that the plague of disunion may be stayed.

Sir, this war, horrible as it is, has taught us all some of the most important and salutary lessons which ever a people learned.

First, it has annihilated, in twenty months, all the false and pernicious theories and teachings of abolitionism for thirty years, and which a mere appeal to facts and argument could not have untangled in half a century. We have learned that the South is not weak, dependent, unenterprising, or corrupted by slavery, luxury, and idleness; but powerful, earnest, warlike, enduring, self-supporting, full of energy, and inexhaustible in resources. We have been taught, and now confess it openly, that African slavery, instead of being a source of weakness to the South, is one of her main elements of strength; and hence the "military necessity," we are told, of abolishing slavery in order to suppress the rebellion. We have learned, also, that the non-slaveholding white men of the South, millions in number, are immovably attached to the institution, and are its chief support; and abolitionists have found out, to their infinite surprise and disgust, that the slave is not "panting for freedom," nor pining in silent but revengeful grief over cruelty and oppression inflicted upon him, but happy, contented, attached deeply to his master, and unwilling—at least not eager—to accept the precious boon of freedom which they have proffered him. I appeal to the President for the proof. I appeal to the fact that fewer slaves have escaped, even from Virginia, in now nearly two years, than Arnold and Cornwallis carried away in six months of invasion in 1781. Finally, sir, we have learned, and the South, too, what the history of the world ages ago, and our own history might have taught us, that servile insurrection is the least of the dangers to which she is exposed. Hence, in my deliberate judgment, African slavery, as an institution, will come out of this conflict fifty-fold stronger than when the war began.

The South, too, sir, has learned most important lessons; and among them, that personal courage is a quality common to all sections, and that, in battle, the men of the North, and especially of the West, are their equals. Hitherto there has been a mutual and most mischievous mistake upon both sides. The South overvalued its own personal courage, and undervalued ours, and we too readily consented; but at the same time she exaggerated our aggregate strength and resources, and under-

estimated her own; and we fell into the same error; and hence the original and fatal mistake or vice of the military policy of the North, and which has already broken down the war by its own weight—the belief that we could bring overwhelming numbers and power into the field and upon the sea, and crush out the South at a blow. But twenty months of terrible warfare have corrected many errors, and taught us the wisdom of a century. And now, sir, every one of these lessons will profit us all for ages to come; and if we do but reunite, will bind us in a closer, firmer, more durable union than ever before.

I have now, Mr. Speaker, finished what I desired to say at this time, upon the great question of the reunion of these States. I have spoken freely and boldly—not wisely, it may be, for the present, or for myself personally, but most wisely for the future and for my country. Not counting censure, I yet do not shrink from it. My own immediate personal interests, and my chances just now for the more material rewards of ambition, I again surrender as hostages to that GREAT HERE-AFTER, the echo of whose footsteps already I hear along the highway of time. Whoever, here or elsewhere, believes that war can restore the Union of these States; whoever would have a war for the abolition of slavery, or disunion; and he who demands southern independence and final separation, let him speak, for him I have offended. Devoted to the Union from the beginning, I will not desert it now in this the hour of its sorest trial.

Sir, it was the day-dream of my boyhood, the cherished desire of my heart in youth, that I might live to see the hundredth anniversary of our national independence, and, as orator of the day, exult in the expanding glories and greatness of the still United States. That vision lingers yet before my eyes, obscured indeed by the clouds and thick darkness and the blood of civil war. But, sir, if the men of this generation are wise enough to profit by the hard experience of the past two years, and will turn their hearts now from bloody intents to the words and arts of peace, to-day will find us again the United States. And it not earlier, as I would desire and believe, at least upon that day let the great work of reunion be consummated; that thenceforth, for ages, the States and the people who shall fill up this mighty continent, united under one Constitution, and in one Union, and the same destiny, shall celebrate it as the birthday both of Independence and of the Great Restoration.

Sir, I repeat it, we are in the midst of the very crisis of this revolution. If, to-day, we secure peace and begin the work of reunion, we shall yet escape; if not, I see nothing before us but universal political and social revolution, anarchy, and bloodshed, compared with which the Reign of Terror in France was a merciful visitation.

and the churches meet again in Christian intercourse, North and South. Let the secret orders and voluntary associations everywhere reunite as brethren once more. In short, give to all the natural and all the artificial causes which impel us together, their fullest sway. Let time do his office—drying tears, dispelling sorrows, mellowing passion, and making herb and grass and tree to grow again upon the hundred battle-fields of this terrible war.

"But this is recognition." It is not formal recognition, to which I will not consent. Recognition now, and attempted permanent treaties about boundary, travel, and trade, and partition of Territories, would end in a war fiercer and more disastrous than before. Recognition is absolute disunion; and not between the slave and the free States, but with Delaware and Maryland as part of the North, and Kentucky and Missouri part of the West. But wherever the actual line, every evil and mischief of disunion is implied in it. And for similar reasons, sir, I would not at this time press hastily a convention of the States. The men who now would hold seats in such a convention, would, upon both sides, if both agreed to attend, come together full of the hate and bitterness inseparable from a civil war. No, sir; let passion have time to cool, and reason to resume its sway. It cost thirty years of desperate and most wicked patience and industry to destroy or impair the magnificent temple of this Union. Let us be content if, within three years, we shall be able to restore it.

But certainly what I propose is informal, practical recognition. And that is precisely what exists to-day, and has existed, more or less defined, from the first. Flags of truce, exchange of prisoners, and all your other observances of the laws, forms, and courtesies of war are acts of recognition. Sir, does any man doubt to-day that there is a confederate government at Richmond, and that it is a "belligerent?" Even the Secretary of State has discovered it at last, though he has written ponderous folios of polished rhetoric to prove that it is not. Will continual war, then, without extended and substantial success, make the confederate States any the less a government in fact?

"But it confesses disunion." Yes, just as the surgeon, who sets your fractured limb in splints, in order that it may be healed, admits that it is broken. But the Government will have failed to "crush out the rebellion." Sir, it has failed. You went to war to prove that we had a Government. With what result? To the people of the loyal States it has, in your hands, been the Government of King Stork, but to the confederate States, of King Log. "But the rebellion will have triumphed." Better triumph to-day than ten years hence. But I deny it. The rebellion will at last be crushed out in the only way in which it ever was possible. "But no one will be hung at the end of war." Neither will there be, though the war should last half a century, except by the mob or the hand of arbitrary power. But really, sir, if there is to be no hanging, let this Administration, and all who have done its bidding everywhere, rejoice and be exceeding glad.

And now, sir, allow me a word upon a subject

of very great interest at this moment, and most important it may be in its influence upon the future—FOREIGN MEDIATION. I speak not of armed and hostile intervention, which I would resist as long as but one man was left to strike a blow at the invader. But friendly mediation—the kindly offer of an impartial Power to stand as a daysman between the contending parties in this most bloody and exhausting strife—ought to be met in a spirit as cordial and ready as that in which it is proffered. It would be churlish to refuse. Certainly, it is not consistent with the former dignity of this Government to ask for mediation; neither, sir, would it befit its ancient magnanimity to reject it. As proposed by the Emperor of France, I would accept it at once. Now is the auspicious moment. It is the speediest, easiest, most graceful mode of suspending hostilities. Let us hear no more of the mediation of cannon and the sword. The day for all that has gone by. Let us be statesmen at last. Sir, I give thanks that some, at least, among the Republican party term ready now to lift themselves up to the height of this great argument, and to deal with it in the spirit of the patriots and great men of other countries and ages, and of the better days of the United States.

And now, sir, whatever may have been the motives of England, France, and the other great Powers of Europe, in withholding recognition so long from the confederate States, the South and the North are both indebted to them for an immense public service. The South has proved her ability to maintain herself by her own strength and resources, without foreign aid, moral or material. And the North and West—the whole country, indeed—these great Powers have served incalculably, by holding back a solemn proclamation to the world that the Union of these States was finally and formally dissolved. They have left to us every motive and every chance for reunion; and if that has been the purpose of England especially—our rival so long; interested more than any other in disunion and the consequent weakening of our great naval and commercial power, and suffering, too, as she has suffered, so long and severely because of this war—I do not hesitate to say that she has performed an act of unselfish heroism without example in history. Was such indeed her purpose? Let her answer before the impartial tribunal of posterity. In any event, after the great reaction in public sentiment in the North and West, to be followed after some time by a like reaction in the South, foreign recognition now of the confederate States could avail little to delay or prevent final reunion; if, as I firmly believe, reunion be not only possible but inevitable.

Sir, I have not spoken of foreign arbitration. That is quite another question. I think it impracticable, and fear it is dangerous. The very Powers—or any other Power—which have hesitated to aid disunion directly or by force, might, as authorized arbiters, most readily pronounce for it at last. Very grand, indeed, would be the tribunal before which the great question of the Union of these States and the final destiny of this continent for ages, should be heard, and historic through all time, the ambassadors who should argue it. And if both belligerents consent, let the

permalife.
pH 8.5